



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

young queen spoke with emotion, and drew protestations of loyalty and support from her hearers, though what they shouted was: "Vitam nostram et sanguinem consecramus!" This exhibition of Hungarian loyalty also had a salutary effect upon the King of Prussia; he hastened to conclude with Austria the treaty of Klein-Schnellendorf.

In the vexed question of the origin of the Seven Years' War, after going over all the evidence, Guglia rejects Lehmann's contentions and holds Austria partly responsible for giving Frederick grounds for thinking that he was in danger of an attack from Austria, and that he was therefore not wholly without justification in the fall of 1756 in making what Moltke would have called a "preventive war". Altogether Guglia's biography gives the best picture of Maria Theresa's personality which has been written.

SIDNEY B. FAY.

*The French Revolution in English History.* By PHILIP ANTHONY BROWN. (London: Crosby Lockwood and Son. 1918. Pp. xiv, 232.)

THE chief fault one finds in this book is its title; it is in fact another account of the influence of the French Revolution on contemporary English politics and writers on political and social subjects. The poets are not entirely neglected, but they receive attention only in as far as they reflect the political ferment of the time. Mr. Brown has not said the final word, but his book is probably the sanest interpretation of a difficult subject that anybody has given. His death in battle has an added element of tragedy in that it deprives him of the chance to revise this book in the light of things that he might better have understood in the psychology of men a century ago by comparing their behavior with that which has happened under our own eyes in the war just ended.

Mr. Brown's instinct for the things that matter led him to look for the roots of the political doctrines of the Revolutionary years in the decades that preceded the French débâcle. He seems to have felt also that more of the English radical movement sprang from the current industrial conditions than he quite says in so many words. Perhaps a final pronouncement on that subject can never be made; whether the British workingmen would have developed organizations so soon without the news from France will always be an unsettled question. Probably Mr. Brown does not set too great store by the French influence, if we agree that French influence was at all real.

The best-reasoned chapters in the book are those that treat of the relations of Pitt's administration with the radical societies and their leaders. On this subject the author used some new material which he found in the Treasury Solicitor's Papers in the Public Record Office. Mr. Brown gives the best account extant of the organization of the radical societies and of the counter-propaganda. His statements, for

the most part, agree substantially with conclusions reached by the reviewer after further study subsequent to the publication of his own *England and the French Revolution*.

The last two chapters in the book on the Revolution's Secondary Effects, in which the author makes an excursion into the nineteenth century, are based on less extensive study and are accordingly less substantial. Perhaps in a less troublous time he might have pursued his investigation into this wider field; in that case, with the perception of the social forces at work in those years which this book reveals, he would have contributed materially toward an understanding of the early history of English democracy. Had Mr. Brown lived to edit the book himself, he would probably have remedied some deficiencies in the footnotes, though they are not serious faults. He might also have become more critical of some of his authorities and so have changed certain details. But, all in all, the work of the editors is creditably done.

One cannot help a final word of regret that a career so promising as this book and the memoir of his life by Gilbert Murray, which it contains, indicate Mr. Brown's to have been was cut short in its beginning.

WILLIAM THOMAS LAPRADE.

*The Deeper Causes of the War.* By ÉMILE HOVELAQUE. Translated by the Author. With an Introduction by Sir Walter Raleigh. (New York: E. P. Dutton and Company. 1916. Pp. 158. \$1.25.)

*The Evolution of Prussia: the Making of an Empire.* By J. A. R. MARRIOTT and C. GRANT ROBERTSON. (Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1917. Pp. 459. \$1.75.)

So long as historians seek to explain the present as the outcome of the past, they are bound to read the past in the light of the present. This means continual reinterpretation, and sometimes a return to an older interpretation. Until the last century, many Prussians and nearly all other Germans regarded the expansion of Prussia simply as the result of superior energy and greater unscrupulousness in the struggle of rival dynasties for land and power. Early in the nineteenth century, Prussian historians developed the theory of a more or less unconscious but very real purpose running through the aggrandizement of their monarchy: the protection of Germany against foreign conquest and rule. There were indeed Germans who preferred foreign rule to that of Prussia, who found the little finger of the Hohenzollerns heavier than the loins of Danish or French rulers; but in the revival of German national sentiment during the Napoleonic wars, many non-Prussian Germans began to regard Prussia as the rock on which a united Germany was to be built. After 1871, many foreign historians accepted the Prussian view: the entire history of Prussia was to be regarded, in the